

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DENA SOLT,

Plaintiff,

v.

CSA AMERICA TESTING &
CERTIFICATION LLC d/b/a CSA GROUP,
a foreign limited liability company; CSA
GROUP TESTING & CERTIFICATION
INC., a foreign corporation; CSA AMERICA
STANDARDS, INC., a foreign corporation,
d/b/a CSA AMERICA STANDARDS; and
CSA AMERICA, INC. d/b/a CSA, a foreign
corporation,

Defendants.

Case No. C24-112-RSM

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

The following matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time, Dkt. #39. Defendants oppose. Dkt. #42. For the following reasons, Plaintiff's Motion is GRANTED.

On May 31, 2024, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss Party. Dkt. #32. Plaintiff filed her response on June 24, 2024. Under the Court's local rules, Plaintiff's Response was timely, as it was filed by the Monday prior to the noting date of Friday, June 28, 2024. *See* former LCR 7(d)(4). However, per the amended local rules as of April 26, 2024, Plaintiff's Response was due 21 days after the filing of Defendant's Motion, on June 21, 2024. *See* current LCR 7(d)(4).

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME - 1

1 Plaintiff states that her “counsel has since conducted training on the newest version of the Local
2 Civil Rules to ensure this error does not occur in the future.” Dkt. #39 at 2.

3 Defendants argue that Plaintiff’s Motion should be denied because it caused prejudice to
4 Defendants due to their required Reply filing date remaining unchanged and because Plaintiff’s
5 contended delay due to potentially filing under seal holds no water. Dkt. #42 at 1-2. Defendants’
6 Reply was due no later than 28 days from the filing date, on June 28, 2024. See LCR 7(d)(4).
7 Defendants filed their Reply on June 28, 2024. See Dkt. #37.

8 “A motion for relief from a deadline should, whenever possible, be filed sufficiently in
9 advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion prior to the deadline,” LCR 7(j),
10 and a motion for relief should be granted where “good cause” exists. See *Allstate Indem. Co. v.*
11 *Lindquist*, No. C20-1508JLR, 2022 WL 1443676, at *2 (W.D. Wash. May 6, 2022). When
12 seeking an extension, the good cause standard primarily considers the diligence of the party
13 seeking the extension. *Id.*

14 The Court understands Plaintiff’s confusion due to the revised noting and filing dates of
15 the local rules and finds good cause to consider her Response. Due to the implications of
16 Defendants’ Motion, Dkt. #32, and ruling on said Motion with no Response from Plaintiff, see
17 LCR 7(b)(2), the Court will consider Plaintiff’s Response.

18 Accordingly, having considered the above Motion and remainder of the record, the Court
19 hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion for Extension of Time, Dkt. #39, is
20 GRANTED.

21 DATED this 29th day of July, 2024.

22 

23 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE